INTERNATIONAL CONCILIATION

Published monthly by the
American Association for International Conciliation
Entered as second class matter at New York, N. Y.
Postoffice, February 23, 1909, under act of July 16, 1891

NAVAL ARMAMENTS

A selection from speeches delivered in Congress on the Naval Appropriation Bills of 1906, 1908, 1909 and 1910

BY

THEODORE E. BURTON
United States Senator from Ohio

DECEMBER, 1910, No. 37

American Association for International Conciliation
Sub-station 84 (501 West 116th Street)
New York City

The Executive Committee of the Association for International Conciliation wish to arouse the interest of the American people in the progress of the movement for promoting international peace and relations of comity and good fellowship between nations. To this end they print and circulate documents giving information as to the progress of these movements, in order that individual citizens, the newspaper press, and organizations of various kinds may have readily available accurate information on these subjects.

For the information of those who are not familiar with the work of the Association for International Conciliation, a list of its publications will be found on page 15.

SELECTIONS FROM SPEECHES DELIVERED IN CONGRESS

BY

HON. THEODORE E. BURTON, OF OHIO,
ON THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILLS OF 1906, 1908, 1909 AND 1910

It is with a hope to promote the cause of Peace and to diminish the careless disregard of the calamities of War that I desire to address the House today.

In discussing this question it is well at the outset to call attention to the growth of our national expenditures. The amount carried in the Bill for Appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910—$135,000,000—is twice as great as the net expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1861, and yet at that time our country contained 35,000,000 of people. In the year 1910 approximately two-thirds of all our expenses were for war. There is grave danger, moreover, that if additional battleships of the model proposed are constructed, larger than any of those in the existing navy, an almost overwhelming pressure will be brought to bear to replace the present ships with those of this larger model. Each nation wishes to be in the forefront in building ships, to have the best navy. If one starts in, all the rest will follow. A statement which I have before me says that the total cost to four nations—the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and Germany—for military and naval expenses in 1907 was $1,184,000,000. If you were to

count in France, Italy, Austria–Hungary, Spain, and other nations, and make allowance for the increase year by year, it is probable that in 1910 the expense would be $2,000,000,000 for the most enlightened nations of the world, because of their military establishments. It is simply impossible that such a pace should continue.

What is going to bring this mad race of military expenditure to an end? One of the first factors will be the economic waste involved in this enormous cost. This problem is sure to be settled in the long run as an economic one. The nations of the earth cannot go on in this mad rush for naval expansion. The burden, if not intolerable, will be intolerable in a very few years. If we study the growth of great movements in politics, if we consider the factors that have made for greater human liberty, it is surprising how many of these movements have had their mainspring and their substantial support in the desire of peoples to be relieved from unjust or oppressive burdens of taxation. With these $2,000,000,000 raised from the civilized nations this condition will not last long before there will be—I will not say an uprising—but such opposition that it must be brought to a stop. We may safely say that, just as it is always darkest before day, so light is already beginning to peer through the darkness. Under more enlightened policies, such as will surely prevail, the limitation of armaments will come by necessity in the very near future. But there are much higher motives in this country of ours which should lead us to oppose these great appropriations.

The manifest tendency in long periods towards a decrease of war is illustrated by the facts of history. In the first place, the attacks of barbarians upon civilized peoples, which caused such devastation in the olden time, have ceased. Then, too, religious wars, at least between different branches of the Christian church, have ceased. Practically they came to an end with the peace of Westphalia, in the year 1648, after the Thirty Years' War. Wars for the aggrandizement of rulers have ceased. The latest wars of this nature may be said to have been those in which Napoleon was engaged. Another class of conflicts, those wars which are caused by uprisings of a people against the existing order and for freer government or greater privilege, are becoming less and less frequent. If we look for any date when this tendency took definite form and gained its greatest impetus, we may point to the year 1815, after the Battle of Waterloo and the Napoleonic wars. Prior to that date the predominant condition in Europe was one of constant struggle between contending nations. Since then the predominant condition has been one of peace.

Just as there has been very great progress in doing away with war, so there has been equal progress in the peaceful settlement of disputes, especially in the last ninety years. From 1815 to 1900 more than 200 controversies between nations were settled by arbitration. Since 1900 there have been over 40 more, and each successive bulletin adds to the list. In these the United States was a party in a very considerable share. These arbitrations have settled the most irritating questions; not only questions of boundary, of

indignities to citizens, of property and personal rights, but all the great range of questions which in the olden times were incitements to war.

But for the inertia which pertains to great political reforms, war would have already disappeared. It is a striking fact that political movements do not show the same orderly development or the same rational and uniform progress as the triumphs of science and of industry. But governments, in their relations with their citizens and in their relations with other countries, must follow the march of public opinion. They cannot linger long behind. Indeed the ideas and pursuits of men have radically changed since that year, and we may rank its advent as constituting an era in the world's progress worthy to be compared with the fifteenth century, with its twin events, the invention of printing and the discovery of America; for as they made a landmark in the progress of the race, so did the disposition toward peace after the fall of Napoleon mark another advance in the same direction. There has been a great difference in the haste with which nations go to war since then. No country can take up the sword without grave occasion or it will have the condemnation of all the rest. If any nation now unjustly attacks another, it must be in the face of an opposition more potent than serried ranks of soldiers or great squadrons of warships. No nation is allowed to annex the whole body of another country. The annexations which have occurred since 1815 have been very largely in instances where a claim of more or less validity existed prior to the outbreak of war. In the same connection

it may be noted that when nations have gained great advantages in war, international congresses have been held to prevent them from obtaining any great territorial accessions. And so it will be in the future. Nations are not now allowed to acquire additional territory without the consent of the rest, except in the case of barbarous tribes occupying territory such as that of Africa or some of the outlying portions of the earth; and their so-called "spheres of influence" are defined. There is a concert of action among nations, a balance of power to be preserved, so that no acquisition shall be made by one without general approval. And if this doctrine has been maintained when we had a weak navy, when we had no navy, and at times when political rivalries and contests were rife in the world, how much more will it be maintained in these early days of the twentieth century, when every tendency is toward a community of interest among nations, when disturbance of the world's peace awakens universal disapprobation, and when the strong are not allowed to impose upon the weak? There is a solidarity of interest among the nations of the earth—such that war will not be tolerated. It is practically impossible between civilized nations unless some irresistible ground for conflict exists. The public opinion of the civilized world is stronger than the armies and navies of the proudest empire.

The whole trend of civilization is in this direction. A potent factor in the abatement of war is the increasing attention of civilized nations to the pursuits of industry and commerce. Those who are engaged in these pursuits seek to prevent war, just as sanitary

science guards against pestilence. Then again, with the growth of the human intellect, with the absorption of men in intellectual pursuits, and with the increased influence of moral forces, war seems more and more appalling. In this period the nations and peoples were not constantly interrupted by war, but could give their attention to other subjects, such as the improvement of conditions, the development of conditions, which make for the betterment of the race.

We should ever keep in mind the analogy between the settlement of disputes between individuals and the settlement of controversies between nations. Ultimately the settlement of contests between nations will be by judicial tribunals of the same general nature as those courts which now decide controversies between individuals. The establishment of local courts was a matter of very slow growth. The barons in the time of the feudal system saw to it that every hill was crowned with a fortress and every passageway over a river was defended, partly for military purposes and partly so that they might levy tribute. Those feudal lords would not admit that the maintenance of armed dependence and of fortresses was for the sake of aggression. The familiar argument of the modern day was used—that these were necessary to preserve peace and for defense. Nevertheless, the feudal barons were frequently engaged in contests. They did not yield to the authority of the magistrate who sought to preserve order or give respect to priests who sought to preserve peace. Yet the system was compelled to yield to a civilization in which there is a rule of law and in which brute force must give way.

It has been said in this discussion that by this naval programme we were showing to the nations of the earth that we are going to protect our interests. Who is threatening our interests in the wide world? Where is there a sentiment in any nation that has one warlike note against the United States? The fundamental fallacy in all these arguments is that in this day neither an individual nor a nation is safe unless he goes armed. Just exactly the contrary is true. The more we abstain from military armaments, the more we abstain from everything that looks toward aggression or the preparation for aggression, the more our interests will be respected in the rest of the world, the more we will be trusted and the greater will be our progress and the friendship for us among all the nations of the earth.

I have listened oftentimes to the talk of our becoming peacemakers by building a navy. How absurd that is! Great Britain starts in as a peacemaker and has a navy sufficient to quell disorder anywhere in the world, to make disorderly people behave themselves. But Germany thinks that it is not enough; she must also be a peacemaker more than Great Britain. France comes into the list, and she must be a peacemaker; and this competition in peacemaking is a spectacle in the eyes of the world. We cannot explain this ambitious programme by the claim that we desire to become the peacemaker of the world. If we make such a claim, the judicious will say it will prove ineffective, the skeptical will term it a dream, and the unfriendly will call it a specious pretense. What does the task of a peacemaker involve? It

requires that when two countries are in or near to a conflict, we will say to them: "You must settle your differences." If they do not agree upon a settlement such as we approve, then we must take the side of one or the other. That means war. It not only means war between us and one or the other, but it means that other nations will be involved in the conflict. So that when we begin to talk of a larger navy to compel nations to do our bidding to make peace, then we are getting away not only from the ancient moorings, from our policy of peace and non-intervention, but from our greatly prized Monroe doctrine. These armed peacemakers will not command confidence. The increase of navies is to increase the might and the prestige of the countries which build them, and for each enlargement in our naval programme the whole world will look with an added degree of suspicion upon us, thinking that our designs are not for peace, but for empire and for the enlargement of our dominion. The progress that will make toward peace will be accomplished by proclaiming to the world the reign of justice, rather than that of force, by proclaiming as well that we are willing to stop short of this ambitious programme. Let it be done in reliance that other peoples will accept our view, believing that an era of arbitration and of peace is better than one of increasing armaments, which is becoming more and more year by year a crushing weight upon the citizens of every land.

What great contention in diplomacy which has made for the greatness of the American name was accomplished by a great navy? The Monroe doctrine was

initiated and established and became a part of the settled policy of nations without the drawing of a sword or firing of a shot. It was initiated at a time when we were a weak, remote people, away from the great, powerful nations of the earth. Our country has enjoyed an unprecedented growth and has attained a position in the very forefront among nations, not by the strength of armies or navies, but by our unique position and by the confidence in our impartiality and justice.

When you abandon these helpful policies and say that not by moral forces, but by means of a navy, with which we shall become involved in conflicts with them all—then shall we lose our opportunity and fail to accomplish such triumphs of amelioration as were achieved under Secretary Hay, under Secretary Root, and under a long line of their illustrious predecessors. No. Let us continue our traditional policy, not indeed one of weakness, nor yet of non-resistance, but one of confidence in our strength as a nation. Our military strength, though mighty in its possibilities, is but a part; our material strength is much more; but most of all can we rely upon those great moral and political principles which have made our country what it is, the eternal principles of justice to all, the equality of man. Those great ideas are stronger than battleships. Along those lines lie our destiny and our glory. We can already claim the position of the proudest and most progressive nation on the globe. How much more, in the coming years, by promoting peace and justice, can we conserve all the influences of the past and gain, in ever-increasing measure, the confidence,

the good will, and the co-operation of all the nations of the earth!

A nation, like an individual, has a mission to perform. Let ours be to hasten the day of arbitration and of peace. If this mad race in building battleships is to continue, mutual distrust one of another and each of all will continue. No other nation can so appropriately take the lead in ushering in the era of peace, which is sure to come. The nations of the world have greater confidence in us. We occupy a position of advantage by reason of the fact that we are protected by the ocean on two sides and are not compelled to guard our borders with frowning fortresses. Our participation in so many arbitrations gives us an advantage as well. And more than all, our free institutions give us a standing no kingdom can enjoy. If, I say, with such advantages, we abate from our naval programme, then we are taking the lead in establishing world peace. It will be a proclamation that will go far and wide over the globe that we are now at peace with all the world, and that we expect to continue at peace with all the world in the future, and, in addition, that we intend to bring to bear all our might, all our power, all our influence to keep the other nations of the earth at peace as well. No nobler mission could fall to the United States. It is the golden opportunity which I trust we may grasp, that mankind in this later day may look to our country to take the lead in the paths that will lead to the world's peace.

Lord Brougham in treating of the law as between individuals said:

> "It was the boast of Augustus that he found Rome of brick and left it of marble. But"—

he added—

> "how much nobler will be the sovereign's boast when he shall have it to say that he found law dear and left it cheap; found it a sealed book and left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich, left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression, and left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence."

And now that the world is coming nearer and nearer to one common brotherhood, may I not say how much nobler yet will be that nation's distinction that found liberty the birthright of the strong alone and gave it to the weak; that found international justice a neglected principle and made it a controlling force; a nation which sought no conquest, but freely offered refuge; one which, not unmindful of national strength or honor, gained its chiefest glory in the happiness and increased opportunity of the individual citizen; a nation which found its competitors limiting their horizon to the mountains and rivers which bound them and taught them to look forth beyond all barriers and learn that all men are made of one blood and have one common destiny.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL CONCILIATION

1. Program of the Association, Baron d'Estournelles de Constant. April, 1907.
2. Results of the National Arbitration and Peace Congress, by Andrew Carnegie. April, 1907.
3. A League of Peace, by Andrew Carnegie. November, 1907.
4. The results of the Second Hague Conference, by Baron d'Estournelles de Constant and Hon. David Jayne Hill. December, 1907.
5. The Work of the Second Hague Conference, by James Brown Scott. January, 1908.
6. Possibilities of Intellectual Co-operation Between North and South America, by L. S. Rowe. April, 1908.
7. America and Japan, by George Trumbull Ladd. June, 1908.
8. The Sanction of International Law, by Elihu Root. July, 1908.
9. The United States and France, by Barrett Wendell. August, 1908.
10. The Approach of the Two Americas, by Joaquim Nabuco. September, 1908.
11. The United States and Canada, by J. S. Willison. October, 1908.
12. The Policy of the United States and Japan in the Far East. November, 1908.
13. European Sobriety in the Presence of the Balkan Crisis, by Charles Austin Beard. December, 1908.
14. The Logic of International Co-operation, by F. W. Hirst. January, 1909.
15. American Ignorance of Oriental Languages, by J. H. DeForest. February, 1909.
16. America and the New Diplomacy, by James Brown Scott. March, 1909.
17. The Delusion of Militarism, by Charles E. Jefferson. April, 1909.
18. The Causes of War, by Elihu Root. May, 1909.
19. The United States and China, by Wei-ching Yen. June, 1909.
20. Opening Address at the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, by Nicholas Murray Butler. July, 1909.
21. Journalism and International Affairs, by Edward Cary. August, 1909.
22. Influence of Commerce in the Promotion of International Peace, by John Ball Osborne. September, 1909.
23. The United States and Spain, by Martin Hume. October, 1909.
24. The American Public School as a Factor in International Conciliation, by Myra Kelly. November, 1909
25. Cecil Rhodes and His Scholars as Factors in International Conciliation, by F. J. Wylie. December, 1909.
26. The East and the West, by Seth Low. January, 1910.
27. The Moral Equivalent of War, by William James. February, 1910.
28. International Unity, by Philander C. Knox. March, 1910.
    The United States and Australia, by Percival R. Cole. March, 1910.
29. The United States and Germany, by Karl Von Lewinski. April, 1910.
30. The United States and Mexico, by James Douglas. May, 1910.
31. The International Duty of the United States and Great Britain, by Edwin D. Mead. June, 1910.
    Opening Address at the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, by Nicholas Murray Butler. June, 1910.
32. An Economic View of War and Arbitration, by John B. Clark, LL.D. July, 1910.
33. Peace *Versus* War: The President's Solution, by Andrew Carnegie. August, 1910.
34. Conciliation through Commerce and Industry in South America, by Charles M. Pepper. September, 1910.
35. International Conciliation in the Far East: A Collection of Papers Upon Various Topics, by Rt. Rev. L. H. Roots, Rev. Dr. J. H. De Forest, Prof. E. D. Burton, Rev. Dr. Gilbert Reid and Hon. John W. Foster. October, 1910.
36. The Capture and Destruction of Commerce at Sea, and Taxation and Armaments, by F. W. Hirst. November, 1910.
37. Selections from Speeches Delivered in Congress on the Naval Appropriation Bills of 1906, 1908, 1909 and 1910, by Hon. Theodore E. Burton. December, 1910.

A small edition of a monthly bibliography of articles having to do with international matters is also published and distributed to libraries, magazines and newspapers.

Up to the limit of the editions printed, any one of the above will be sent postpaid upon receipt of a request addressed to the Secretary of the American Association for International Conciliation, Post Office Sub-Station 84, New York, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER
RICHARD BARTHOLDT
LYMAN ABBOTT
JAMES SPEYER
STEPHEN HENRY OLIN
SETH LOW
ROBERT A. FRANKS
PAUL MORTON
GEORGE BLUMENTHAL

COUNCIL OF DIRECTION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL CONCILIATION

LYMAN ABBOTT, NEW YORK.
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, BOSTON.
EDWIN A. ALDERMAN, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.
CHARLES H. AMES, BOSTON, MASS.
RICHARD BARTHOLDT, M. C., ST. LOUIS, MO.
GEORGE BLUMENTHAL, NEW YORK.
CLIFTON R. BRECKENRIDGE, FORT SMITH, ARKANSAS.
WILLIAM J. BRYAN, LINCOLN, NEB.
T. E. BURTON, CLEVELAND, OHIO.
NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER, NEW YORK.
ANDREW CARNEGIE, NEW YORK.
EDWARD CARY, NEW YORK.
JOSEPH H. CHOATE, NEW YORK.
RICHARD H. DANA, BOSTON, MASS.
ARTHUR L. DASHER, MACON, GA.
HORACE E. DEMING, NEW YORK.
CHARLES W. ELIOT, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
JOHN W. FOSTER, WASHINGTON, D. C.
ROBERT A. FRANKS, ORANGE, N. J.
JOHN ARTHUR GREENE, NEW YORK.
JAMES M. GREENWOOD, KANSAS CITY, MO.
FRANKLIN H. HEAD, CHICAGO, ILL.
WILLIAM J. HOLLAND, PITTSBURGH, PA.
HAMILTON HOLT, NEW YORK.
JAMES L. HOUGHTELING, CHICAGO, ILL.
DAVID STARR JORDAN, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CAL.
J. H. KIRKLAND, NASHVILLE, TENN.
ADOLPH LEWISOHN, NEW YORK.
SETH LOW, NEW YORK.
CLARENCE H. MACKAY, NEW YORK.
THEODORE MARBURG, BALTIMORE, MD.
BRANDER MATTHEWS, NEW YORK.
SILAS MCBEE, NEW YORK.
GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN, NEW YORK.
W. W. MORROW, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PAUL MORTON, NEW YORK.
LEVI P. MORTON, NEW YORK.
STEPHEN H. OLIN, NEW YORK.
A. V. V. RAYMOND, BUFFALO, N. Y.
IRA REMSEN, BALTIMORE, MD.
JAMES FORD RHODES, BOSTON, MASS.
HOWARD J. ROGERS, ALBANY, N. Y.
ELIHU ROOT, WASHINGTON, D. C.
J. G. SCHURMAN, ITHACA, N. Y.
ISAAC N. SELIGMAN, NEW YORK.
F. J. V. SKIFF, CHICAGO, ILL.
WILLIAM M. SLOANE, NEW YORK.
ALBERT K. SMILEY, LAKE MOHONK, N. Y.
JAMES SPEYER, NEW YORK.
OSCAR S. STRAUS, WASHINGTON, D. C.
MRS. MARY WOOD SWIFT, BERKELEY, CAL.
GEORGE W. TAYLOR, M. C., DEMOPOLIS, ALA.
O. H. TITTMAN, WASHINGTON, D. C.
W. H. TOLMAN, NEW YORK.
BENJAMIN TRUEBLOOD, BOSTON, MASS.
EDWARD TUCK, PARIS, FRANCE.
WILLIAM D. WHEELWRIGHT, PORTLAND, ORE.

CONCILIATION INTERNATIONALE

119 RUE DE LA TOUR, PARIS, FRANCE

President Fondateur, BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT
Member Hague Court, Senator

Honorary Presidents: BERTHELOT and LEON BOURGEOIS, Senators
Secretaries General: A. METIN and JULES RAIS
Treasurer: ALBERT KAHN